DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 501 HE 035 538

AUTHOR	DeNeef, A. Leigh
TITLE	The Preparing Future Faculty Program: What Difference Does It Make? PFF Occasional Paper Series.
INSTITUTION	Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.; Council of Graduate Schools, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.
REPORT NO	PFF-OP-8
ISBN	ISBN-0-911696-87-3
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	38p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Educational Change; Graduate Study; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program was launched in 1993 to develop new models of doctoral preparation for a faculty career by including preparation for teaching and academic citizenship as well as for research. Through national competitions, grants have been awarded to 43 doctoral producing universities to develop and implement model programs to bring expectations for undergraduate professors into the graduate preparation of future academics. One of the stipulations of these grants has been that universities must form a cluster of institutions so that graduate students can have experience with faculty life as it is lived at diverse institutions. Since the first of these initiatives was launched in 1994, the program has done a good deal of assessment. This study was an evaluation of the central premise of PFF that these new programs produce alumni who are better assistant professors than their counterparts with more traditional preparation. Findings in this study are based on questionnaire surveys completed by 129 individuals who completed a PFF program, received a doctorate, secured a faculty position, and agreed to complete a questionnaire. Follow-up telephone interviews were held with 25 individuals. Findings show that graduates illustrate the commitment of alumni to promoting continuation of PFF and similar programs. Alumni are grateful for what the program gave them, and they have assumed the responsibility to give something back. For these academics, PFF has smoothed the transition between graduate school and their initial academic positions and has brought them into the larger conversation of academic reform. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Association of American Colleges & Universities

ED 471 501

The Preparing Future Faculty Program: What Difference Does It Make?

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T.G. James.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

By A. Leigh DeNeef

Preparing Future Faculty

ED355538

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Preparing Future Faculty program is sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Council of Graduate Schools. The program is made possible with funding from the participating institutions and by grants from The Pew Charitable Trusts, the National Science Foundation, and The Atlantic Philanthropies.

This publication is made possible with funding from The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Copyright © 2002
Association of American Colleges & Universities
1818 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009
202/387-3760

ISBN No. 0-911696-87-3

The Preparing Future Faculty Program: What Difference Does It Make?

by A. Leigh DeNeef

Association of American Colleges and Universities

Council of Graduate Schools

PFF Occasional Paper Series

Anderson, H. J., G. Gaff, and A.S. Pruitt-Logan. n.d. *Frequently asked questions about Preparing Future Faculty.* Number 1. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

DeNeef, A. L. 1996. *Lessons of PFF concerning the job market.* Number 2. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Pruitt, A.S.. n.d. *The Preparing Future Faculty program and teaching assistant training: Building bridges.* Number 3. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Tice, S. L. 1997. *The relationships between faculty preparation programs and teaching assistant development programs.* Number 4. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Bogle, E., J. A. Blondin, J. L. Miller, and the PFF Staff. 1997. *Memo to graduate students: Preparing to be the faculty of the future.* Number 5. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Pruitt-Logan, A. S., J. G. Gaff, and R. A. Weibl. 1998. *The impact: Assessing the experiences of PFF program participants, 1994-1996.* Number 6. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Adams, K. 2002. *What colleges and universities want in new faculty.* Number 7. Washington, D.C.:Association of American Colleges and Universities.

DeNeef, A.L. 2002. *The Preparing Future Faculty Program: What difference does it make?* Number 8. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Applegate, J. L. 2002. *Engaged graduate education: Seeing with new eyes.* Number 9. Washington, D.C.: Association of American College and Universities.

About This Publication

The Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program was launched in 1993 to develop new models of doctoral preparation for a faculty career by including preparation for teaching and academic citizenship as well as for research. Through a series of four national competitions, grants have been awarded to forty-three doctoral producing universities and their departments to develop and implement such model programs that bring expectations for undergraduate professors into the graduate preparation of future academics. One stipulation of grants has been that the universities cannot do this work by themselves; they must form a cluster of diverse institutions so that the graduate students can have direct, personal experience with faculty life as it is lived in institutions with different missions, student bodies, and expectations for faculty. Often the students work with an assigned mentor at another institution.

Since the first of these new programs was introduced in 1994, we have done a great deal of assessment. We also know a great deal about good practice in the operations of PFF programs and about how PFF participants—graduate students, graduate faculty, and faculty from partner institutions—judge the value of their experiences (generally, very positively). But only recently have these new programs produced enough alumni who have found faculty positions and have gained enough experience to assess the value of PFF in their early faculty careers. The basic premise of PFF is that these new preparation programs produce alumni who are better assistant professors than their counterparts with more traditional preparation that focuses almost exclusively on learning to do scholarly research. Until now, this premise has been supported only by anecdotal evidence.

We commissioned Dr. Leigh DeNeef, professor of English and associate dean of the graduate school at Duke University, and his colleagues to assess this central premise. The present essay summarizes their major findings. The results are based on questionnaire surveys of 129 individuals who completed a PFF program, received their doctorate, secured a faculty position, and agreed to complete their questionnaire. They also are based on a qualitative analysis of follow-up telephone interviews with twenty-five individuals. While the numbers are small and there was no control group, these results begin to flesh out a more systematic understanding of the outcomes of these new faculty preparation programs.

Jerry G. Gaff
Co-Director, Preparing Future Faculty

Anne S. Pruitt-Logan
Co-Director, Preparing Future Faculty

The Preparing Future Faculty Program: What difference does it make?

I. Introduction

Since its inception in the early 1990s, the Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program has been promoted as better preparing graduate students to assume their places in the next generation of the professoriate by exposing them to faculty roles and responsibilities in a variety of academic settings. Although the precise shape of the original seventeen "clusters" differed (clusters generally included one research university and at least one comprehensive university, a community college, a liberal arts college, and an historically black college or university), all shared a common set of general goals:

- to provide graduate students with on-site experience of faculty life at diverse academic institutions by pairing them with faculty mentors at neighboring colleges and universities and by creating specific opportunities for visitations to the cluster campuses;

- to provide forums, both on and off the research campus, at which graduate students and faculty from diverse institutions could speak candidly about professional expectations regarding, and the relationships between, faculty research, teaching, and service;

- to encourage graduate programs themselves to integrate the professional development of graduate students, including appropriately structured pedagogical training and teaching experiences, more directly into graduate education.

Early results from the PFF programs were extremely encouraging. Graduate students found PFF both enlightening and empowering, particularly as it legitimized conversations about teaching/learning issues and provided them with a clearer sense of the range of career trajectories open to them. Cluster and other "hiring" institutions felt that PFF experiences provided new Ph.D.s with important initial "seasoning" in academic life and a head start on their professional development. And several national organizations began promoting core PFF principles as instrumental in redirecting graduate education toward more realistic career prospects. Despite these positive signs, however, PFF proponents had very little hard data about the overall impact of participation in a PFF program on the early career success of new faculty.

By 1998-99, however, a sufficient number of PFF students had graduated, assumed academic positions, and gained enough experience as faculty members to allow a small national survey of alumni from selected PFF clusters to evaluate how their participation in the program affected their subsequent faculty experiences. Thus, in the summer of 1998, and again in the spring of 2001, a working group of faculty and graduate students at Duke University conducted a survey on behalf of the sponsoring organizations: the Council of Graduate Schools and the Association of American Colleges and Universities. The survey was sent to 271 PFF alumni from Arizona State University, Duke University, Florida State University, Howard University, University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, and the University of Washington. One hundred and twenty-nine (129) graduates (48 percent) responded to the survey.

The survey offers important new evidence that PFF makes a real difference in the professional lives of beginning academics.

Alumni were asked to assess quantitatively a number of different features of their PFF experiences—both general assessments of the extent to which programs increased their knowledge of the academic job market process, the dimensions of faculty roles at different institutions, and practical matters of effective teaching. They were asked for more particular assessments of their PFF mentoring relationships, their visits to cluster campuses, and the PFF activities organized at their home institution. Survey participants were also invited to elaborate more qualitatively upon how they felt PFF had directly affected their choice of academic career path, their actual securing of a job, and their initial transition from graduate student to faculty member. Subsequently, twenty-five respondents participated in a follow-up phone conversation with at least one member of the working group. What follows, then, is a summary of lessons learned from the survey itself, including the narrative answers and responses from the telephone interviews.

From the outset it is necessary to admit that this survey is but a first step in overall assessment of the difference PFF has made: The numbers of PFF alumni nationally are still relatively small in relation to total numbers of Ph.D.s produced annually in the U.S. Moreover, the survey did not attempt to compare the PFF experience with a non-PFF control group or with alumni who chose non-academic careers. Since completion of the survey, however, a number of other national studies—such as Maresi Nerad and Joseph Cerny's unpublished survey of Ph.D.s ten years later, Chris Golde's *At Cross Purposes*, and the recent National Association of Graduate and Professional Students (NAGPS) National Doctoral

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey—have appeared. They show a strikingly similar demand among graduate students for more information about possible career trajectories, more sustained pedagogical training, and more effective faculty mentoring. The participants in these national studies might well serve as a surrogate control group for the current survey.

Comparative assessments from the qualitative sections of the survey must also be weighed carefully, since the number of alumni from individual PFF schools varies greatly, as do the particular PFF activities emphasized by the distinct clusters. The "story of PFF" thus remains the anecdotal stories of those individuals who both chose to participate in the program and were successful in securing academ ic employment after they graduated. Nonetheless, despite these limitations, we believe the survey offers important new evidence that PFF makes a real difference in the professional lives of beginning academics.

II. General Findings from the Survey

It is useful to begin with the eight general categories of the survey:

- Non-PFF Professional Development Programs on home campus
- Knowledge PFF added regarding Academic Job Search
- Knowledge PFF added regarding Faculty Roles/Responsibilities
- Knowledge PFF added regarding Teaching Issues
- Value of PFF Mentor Relationship
- Value of Cluster Site Visits (represents two survey categories)
- Value of PFF Activities at Home Institution
- Overall Impact of PFF

Of these categories, the mentoring relationship and the PFF programs organized at the home institution proved the most valuable to those surveyed, closely followed by the site visits to the cluster campuses (see Table C. All Tables are in the Appendix). By some significant gap, the least valuable component of the students' experience were the non-PFF professional development programs offered (or in many cases, not offered at all) at the home institution. These findings are not surprising, and they corroborate what many have believed for some time, namely, that graduate programs pay little attention to the overall professional development of their graduate students, that graduate faculty have very little direct knowledge of or interest in faculty life at non-research universities, and that

an effective way to provide this broader professional knowledge is simply to give graduate students organized access to a variety of academic settings.

Also important in these figures is the strong sense that PFF students sought from their faculty mentors more than guidance on research matters. They really valued the opportunity PFF provided to speak with a faculty mentor about a wider range of issues and life experiences than they felt comfortable discussing with their own faculty advisors. In fact, although not all PFF alumni had direct experience with a cluster faculty mentor or even a visit to a cluster campus, five of the eight most highly valued experiences of the alumni were clearly focused on the relationship they had with cluster faculty (see Table A). One might posit any number of explanations for this: It is easier to talk about some professional issues with a faculty member who does not hold your successful completion of the degree in his or her hand; or, cluster faculty, generally volunteering to serve as graduate student mentors, took this responsibility more seriously and thought about it more deeply than the graduate faculty. Yet, it does confirm what many other surveys have found about the relative weakness of the typical graduate-faculty mentoring system.

Looking more closely at the "value questions" of the survey (Tables A and B), two distinct types of analysis are possible. First is the simple summary of mean scores: of the forty-two questions asking students to rate the value of a particular PFF experience, sixteen received mean scores of 3.6 or higher (on a 1 to 5-point scale, with 5 representing "highly valuable"). It could be argued, then, that the majority of PFF alumni found the following experiences moderately to highly valuable in their overall preparation for subsequent academic careers:

- Discussions with individual faculty mentors and faculty groups on both the home and the cluster campuses regarding faculty roles and responsibilities (4.0 mean score); balancing the three faculty duties of research, teaching and service (3.9 mean); differing structures of institutional governance, including the politics of individual departments (3.6); hiring criteria and expectations of new faculty at different institutions (3.6); and the general nature of faculty life at those institutions, including evaluation, reward and tenure systems, salary levels, teaching loads, research and service expectations (3.9).

- Direct observation (often followed by further discussions) of classes on the cluster campus (4.2 and 3.9), faculty meetings (3.7), the daily routine of the faculty mentor (3.7), and strategies for teaching diverse student populations (3.7).

- Opportunities for and assistance in developing a statement of teaching philosophy (4.0), developing a professional portfolio (3.8), assessing one's own teaching (3.8), and developing practical strategies for teaching large lecture classes, smaller seminars, and discussion or laboratory sections (3.6).

One question, coming at the very end of the survey, may be said to stand out from the others receiving high scores. When asked whether or not PFF had been valuable in terms of helping them better understand and make an informed choice about the options available for their academic careers, nearly all alumni agreed that the program had been very important in preparing them for that decision (3.9). This score, as shown below, was borne out in the narrative comments alumni provided on the survey and might itself be taken as eloquent testimony to the overall success of the program in better educating graduate students about the range of career prospects before them.

A second level of analysis might focus on those activities that a majority of the seventeen national PFF programs put in place and that proved valuable for the PFF alumni. In other words, what particular kinds of programs might graduate education in general take away from the PFF experience in order to better prepare all graduate students for future academic employment? (It is often objected that graduate education needs to address the entire spectrum of potential post-graduate or post-doctoral employment, not just academic options. The Preparing Future Faculty program has never disputed this assertion; it has, however, insisted that its own mission is more narrowly focused on the preparation of future academics). From this perspective, it is instructive to return to Table A where it is clear that, except for opportunities to observe a variety of classes or faculty meetings on the cluster campuses, over 80 percent of existing PFF programs offered the same set of fifteen or sixteen highly rated core experiences. It is important to emphasize that at least ten of these experiences took place on the cluster campuses and five originated on the graduate school campus (see again Table C). This suggests that the overall mission of preparing the next generation of academics should not be viewed as falling to the nation's graduate schools alone. A far better model would be one that seeks active participation and collaboration of the other sectors of higher education.

The overall mission of preparing the next generation of academics should not be viewed as falling to the nation's graduate schools alone.

A somewhat different perspective can be gained by examining Table E, particularly in relationship to Table A. Table E is sorted by those activities not covered in the PFF program of the survey respondents. Many of these activities are understandably minimized in most PFF programs: While a few PFF alumni did have valuable experiences in collaborating with a cluster faculty member on a research

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

project, working with the cluster mentor in developing their statement of research interests or locating potential academic employment, these activities are effectively handled at the home institution and in discussion with the Ph.D. advisor. And yet, several of the most valued experiences of a number of alumni, as evident from their narrative comments, were never available to many of their PFF peers. In this category one might put crafting a cover letter for job applications, preparing for job presentations at different kinds of academic institutions, handling job offers (i.e., what can/should you ask about and who can/should you ask), or negotiating the first years on the job. Graduate programs have very little expertise in these matters for any institution other than a research university, and PFF alumni often spoke of the benefits of getting the "cluster school" perspective on them. Thus, while all PFF programs developed discussion groups on faculty roles and expectations at various institutions, not all of them followed through at the very pragmatic levels of preparing their graduate students for either opening inquiries or on-campus interviews/presentations for academic positions at those institutions. Here too more active collaboration among research and non-research schools could provide a richer preparation for developing academics.

Tables F and G offer a demographic snapshot of the survey respondents: Table F reports mean "value" scores sorted by ethnicity; Table G reports the same scores sorted by the academic discipline of the respondents. Two points are worth making here. The first is that PFF experiences are consistently valued more highly by Asian and African American students than by majority students. This observation was corroborated in subsequent alumni interviews, which emphasized that for many participants in graduate education, PFF served a doubly important acculturation function.

Some graduate faculty are realizing the importance of pedagogical issues to apprentice teachers.

Second, in terms of academic disciplines, alumni from professional programs and the physical sciences generally found PFF activities more valuable than alumni from the humanities or the biological or social sciences. Such differences suggest that graduate programs in these areas have not devoted as much programmatic attention to matters of concern to PFF, perhaps because academic careers are here more the exception than the rule. Still, it also means that graduate students in these fields who seek academic employment frequently need extra-departmental programs to provide adequate preparation for that goal.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. Alumni Narratives: Survey Statements and Telephone Interviews:

A. Differences PFF made on the research campus

Before summarizing the difference PFF alumni feel the program has made in two key areas of academic employment—negotiating the job market and managing the initial years in the academy—it may be useful to give a brief overview of the difference PFF made in the graduate training of alumni. Although it is important to emphasize again that distinctions among PFF programs at the various national clusters make generalizations extremely difficult, PFF alumni are, nonetheless, relatively consistent in articulating the ways that PFF has begun literally "to change the climate" on the graduate campuses, at least for those who participate in the program. As one alumna dramatically put it, graduate school "was not the intellectual community I'd expected. PFF helped to fill this void." Riche Richardson (English, Duke) put it somewhat differently by suggesting that she began graduate school during a major "paradigm shift" to what she terms the "preprofessionalization" of graduate students. PFF, she says, "is indispensable to students who are adjusting to the changing shape of graduate education" nationally. A main component of that change is helping prospective Ph.D.s assess their career options by understanding the institutional roles and tasks they would take on or assume at different academic settings.

One of the foremost changes PFF has effected is legitimizing conversations about teaching: Some graduate faculty are realizing the importance of pedagogical issues to apprentice teachers, and it has provided graduate students with a credible forum for talking about teaching issues. Obviously, changing the perspectives of graduate faculty members is not easy. Since many of them do not think of themselves primarily as teachers, they are not always appreciative of the instructional needs of their graduate trainees. For David Karp (sociology, University of Washington), it was "tremendously exciting and rewarding to have time devoted to teaching and professionalization issues that otherwise were limited to hallway conversations." For Wendy Crone (engineering, University of Minnesota), PFF provided invaluable pedagogical assistance by bringing her into intellectual conversations about college teaching with graduate student colleagues outside her own discipline. This mix of people and perspectives, another PFF graduate said, helped break down the isolation she felt within her own department by often being the only graduate student willing even to confess an interest in teaching. Jennifer Egert (psychology, Duke University) agreed: "PFF provided professional support that I could not get in my department, and my PFF mentor [from Guilford College] made me, for the first time, feel part of a community of teachers."

This report, of course, is not the first to suggest that graduate students in the nation's Research I universities see their faculty mentors as not only generally unsupportive of their desire for more pedagogical training, but even antagonistic to such training, since the faculty assumption has been that they are really preparing people for research positions just like theirs. David Karp sharply summarized the attitude of many faculty in his department: "If you get a job at a liberal arts school, that's your failure rather than your success." After the experience of PFF, however, more faculty, according to the alumni surveyed, seem to have learned a valuable lesson about student needs for better academic and professional mentoring, more organized preparation for a wider array of academic and non-academic job prospects, and generally more open conversations about faculty roles and responsibilities in different academic settings.

Although nearly all of the alumni interviewed would probably agree with Karl Oswald (psychology, Duke) that graduate school was "really not preparing people to be faculty members" as much as researchers, most felt that PFF was gradually broadening faculty recognition of alternative and more complicated career trajectories and leading them to devise programs to help students prepare for a wider variety of futures. As PFF becomes ever more institutionalized, as well as more focused at the level of individual departments and supported by their professional disciplinary associations, there is every reason to expect further engagement of graduate faculty members with PFF initiatives and interests.

Several alumni spoke about the role PFF played in making them conscious of a professional, disciplinary world beyond the research university. Meeting faculty on the cluster campuses for whom teaching and research exist in synergistic relationship was an eye-opening experience for many. David Karp learned, through PFF, that not only was there "a world of people out there who cared about teaching," but also that "there was a world of professional sociologists beyond the research institution." Wendy Crone learned the same lesson: "PFF taught me the value of colleagues outside my discipline; it taught me that my own academic networks needed to incorporate people outside of engineering." Joel Foisy (mathematics, Duke) also thought it was important to his graduate education to meet regularly with people outside of the mathematics department. He reports that he has continued this extra-departmental faculty interaction at SUNY-Potsdam as a way to facilitate fresh pedagogical and professional perspectives. Carlos Morrison (communications, Howard) says PFF "gave me a wider perspective on the professoriate."

When Wendy Crone and other alumni speak about how "phenomenal" PFF was in "giving a broader picture of higher education in this country," they are voicing more than an appreciation of institutional diversity. Unlike a previous generation that tended to divide the academy into rigid hierarchical levels, this genera-

tion seems sensitive to interests, concerns, and challenges shared by all academics. Liberal arts and community college faculty are not people who failed to land the jobs they wanted; rather, they are professional, disciplinary colleagues whose careers led them to different academic venues. Carlos Morrison speaks for many of his PFF peers in observing how effective the program was in bringing together faculty and students who would not normally interact even though they might be, literally, just next door or across the street. These "partnerships," Kathleen Godfrey (English, Arizona State) observes, "enrich" the entire educational experience for everyone and create a broader academic sense of "community."

The increasingly focused specialization in many graduate programs is poor preparation for today's job market.

Increased sensitivity among PFF alumni to how disciplines themselves look different in various academic settings is accompanied by a growing recognition that the increasingly focused specialization in many graduate programs is poor preparation for today's job market. Many liberal arts and community colleges are demanding faculty who can teach not only broadly within their own discipline, but even in related disciplines. For some alumni, this was a difficult lesson, and it meant that some career paths would not be open unless they made a conscious effort to broaden their own intellectual and research backgrounds. George Ehrhardt (history, Duke) says that what he remembered from his PFF "visits to Guilford College was the difficulty that would be involved in integrating my own field [the history of science] into that of a small department in any meaningful way." One of his colleagues, Ray Person (religion, Duke), says PFF made him understand that he would have to develop a broader teaching field than his graduate program required if he was going to be a credible candidate for the career path he wanted. Kathleen Godfrey says that PFF enabled her to reconceive and market herself for a disciplinary field (English education) completely differently from her doctoral specialization (in American literature). This willingness to redefine herself professionally would have been less likely had PFF not given her a broader sense of disciplinary possibilities.

Finally, several alumni spoke about the importance of PFF as a mechanism for helping to acculturate graduate students into the academy in general. Graduate students are astonishingly naive about how academic institutions really work, although not all faculty seem to recognize this and few graduate programs have taken sufficient steps to try to address it. Students enter graduate school, of course, from a variety of educational institutions, and even after ten or twelve

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

years in higher education, they still know relatively little about faculty governance, the role of central administration, or a host of other issues concerning the "business" of academia. This is especially true for first-generation students. Such people, Carlota Ocampo (psychology, Howard) reminds us, usually "have to construct their knowledge of the academy almost *in toto*." For this group, Carlota emphasizes, PFF is doubly important. Stuart Noble-Goodman (English, Duke) agrees: "I think this process of acculturation . . . is one of the most important contributions of PFF to the academy." A Northwestern alumna put the matter this way: "I feel like I did a pretty good job [of preparing myself for an academic career], but often I had to go out and find things for myself. . . . My biggest wish would be that departments . . . and advisors would help to make programs like PFF more visible to students, so that it's not totally their responsibility" to educate themselves about the inner workings of academic life. In most instances, "graduate students don't even know where to begin." Without this broader knowledge, of course, students have a much more difficult time assessing where they might find the best personal and professional fit within the broad terrain of higher education in this country.

B. Differences PFF Made in Negotiating the Job Market

If changing the climate on the graduate campus was one way PFF improved the day-to-day life of at least those students who participated in the program, changing their comfort level in the job market seems to have been its most universal impact. Although the question did not receive high scores on the quantitative portion of the survey (3.3), virtually all the alumni who agreed to be interviewed said that whatever career path they followed, PFF made them feel that the choice was really their own and allowed them to "hit the ground running." Scott Howard (English) reports that at the University of Washington, PFF "raised the consciousness among graduate students about the realities of the job market and how to better prepare for that." David Karp agreed, adding that PFF was "enormously useful in terms of framing the whole job application process and how to market yourself for different institutions."

PFF students felt generally better about themselves—surer, smarter, more "in the know," more professionally competent—in the market than their peers.

For some alumni, PFF was more than "useful." For Jennifer Egert, it literally "opened up alternative career paths beyond a life in either clinical practice or a Research I university." Wendy Crone had a similar experience: "Since I came from

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

industry, PFF was one of the key things that helped me see the breadth of opportunities in the academy. It also taught me what kinds of skills each of these opportunities would require and, therefore, how to be a viable candidate. For me, in other words, it really made an academic position possible." For some alumni, like Jason Cody (chemistry, Northwestern), PFF confirmed an earlier choice to pursue a career at a liberal arts college; for others, like Susan Swithers (psychology, Duke) and Angela Bryan (psychology, Arizona State), it confirmed the research university route. For still others, like Charles Cogan (history, Northwestern), it "exposed the fact that you can have a rewarding career at a community college." An anonymous alumnus from Florida State sums up the preparation PFF offered: "Before PFF, I hadn't given much thought to how many different things 'assistant professor' could mean, depending on the type of institution at which you work. PFF opened my eyes."

Two generalizations can be made about how PFF prepared students for the job market. First, PFF students felt that they knew more about the American academic scene and the variety of institutions that comprise it than their non-PFF competitors. (Absent confirming data, it is impossible to know whether or not the alumni are correct in this assumption, but their own confidence may be the more relevant issue.) In the words of Carlota Ocampo, the very fact that you have PFF experience "distinguishes you from the rest of the job applicants." Kim Zeuli (engineering, Minnesota) put it this way: "My non-PFF colleagues/competitors did not have the knowledge that I had about the differences between various kinds of colleges and universities." The effect of this ostensibly greater savvy was that PFF students felt generally better about themselves—surer, smarter, more "in the know," more professionally competent—in the market than their peers. It gave me, says Carlos Morrison, "a real edge."

Second, they felt, almost to a person, that they knew better how to present themselves as professionals who could "fit" in different institutional environments. Carlos Morrison states that the most important contribution PFF made to his professional development was the opportunity to teach in a variety of institutional settings. This experience, he says, "made me feel I could operate anywhere." Wendy Crone said that PFF "helped me figure out the things I needed to do to make myself more viable, and it prompted me, even in graduate school, to do things—like reviewing journal submissions—that I wouldn't have naturally pursued because I realized the advantages they would give me later on." James Rolf (mathematics, Duke) says PFF forced him "to rethink my own personal niche—the precise balance that I wanted in my career between teaching and research." Stuart Noble-Goodman says it this way: "I was far more savvy about what a potential employer was looking for and how to present myself in the most persuasive light."

Even alumni whose initial positions were post-doctoral appointments (as is normally the case in the sciences) appreciate the advantages PFF provided for the job market. Jennifer Egert is a case in point: "PFF helped me understand the radical differences in the missions of academic institutions—different roles for faculty, different kinds of students, differences in what counts as publication, etc. These things will guide me in my career choices." Angela Bryan's experience was even more telling, in that she intentionally asked to teach a class during her postdoctoral appointment at the University of Kentucky so that she could "practice" achieving the kind of balance between her research and teaching that her PFF program taught her she would need when she began her academic career. As a result, when Angela accepted a tenure-track job at the University of Colorado, she not only had considerable experience in precisely this delicate balancing of faculty responsibilities, but she also had two courses ready to offer.

PFF helped students prepare for the job market in other very specific ways: writing an introductory letter of "interest"; developing a CV; fashioning a teaching, research, or diversity statement; preparing professional and teaching portfolios; anticipating the job interview and the campus visit; addressing potential colleagues; talking to deans and presidents; organizing the job talk. Some of this "new" knowledge came at a painful price:

> While sitting around the faculty lounge with various English professors at Meredith College [a women's college in the Duke cluster], our discussion turned to a recent [faculty] search they had conducted. They bemusedly recounted a number of letters they had received from applicants that followed the formula of introduction, dissertation description, research program description, a bit about teaching, and conclusion. These letters, as they bluntly put it, went straight into the garbage, because they showed no understanding of what kind of institution Meredith is. . . . I looked over at my colleague, Ted Hovet, and saw on his face the same crestfallen look I imagine was on my own—both of us had applied for the position under discussion, and both of us had written precisely the kind of letter they had thrown away.

Several of the alumni we spoke with echoed Stuart Noble-Goodman's embarrassment here at not understanding how inappropriate his letter of inquiry really was. Even more emphasized the fact that, in this particular area, they had to rely totally on the cluster campus faculty because their own graduate mentors had few clues about how to fashion such letters and were, in some instances, insisting upon rhetorical and structural formulae virtually guaranteed not to get them past an initial reading—if they even got that far.

PFF contributed to the creation of stronger CVs and credible teaching, research, or diversity statements. Jennifer Egert, among others, speaks about how critical PFF was in "helping me develop the teacher part of my professional identity." Nor is she alone. Wendy Crone says PFF was the only mechanism for giving her an independent teaching experience. Carlota Ocampo, noting how invaluable PFF was in preparing her for the job market, clarifies that it "gave me a good set of very positive teaching evaluations and a strong teaching portfolio." Susan Swithers said that her teaching experiences made her more marketable even at Research I institutions. Wendy Crone explains her sense of the relationship between strong CVs and teaching statements and another key moment of the job search, the one-on-one interaction at job interviews. PFF "helped me put together a credible teaching statement. . . . My current employers said they rarely got such statements, and it helped them to know me better." Speaking of another interview, Wendy reports, "One set of interviewers was concerned that I wasn't experienced enough or up to the challenges of an academic career, but after talking to me about my PFF experiences their fears were relieved."

The majority of alumni interviewed agreed that talking about the PFF experiences in job interviews was an important ingredient in getting them to the next phase in the hiring process. Scott Howard said that "interviewers wanted to talk about PFF, and it was fun for me to talk about my experiences." Kim Zeuli had the same feelings: "Most of the people at my interviews were both surprised and impressed by my PFF experience; they thought it was a wonderful preparation." Wendy Crone says that at her on-campus interviews, "the dean knew of PFF and valued my participation in it." Stuart Noble-Goodman felt his PFF experience greatly expanded his understanding of faculty culture, how it was changing, and the implications of those changes. "That understanding enabled me to be comfortable with senior faculty and administrators. And I was treated as a colleague, a crucial psychological position for a graduate student or a new Ph.D." Even when they did not talk specifically about their PFF experiences, alumni report that PFF helped them feel much less anxious about the interview process. Kathee Godfrey reports that she was "a lot calmer about prospective interviews" than her non-PFF classmates because her program taught her what to expect.

Throughout the job market process, Wendy Crone says she "found herself constantly going back to my PFF material" to negotiate the next phase. She, like most alumni, felt that her PFF program provided crucial information and critical strategies at this extremely tense and pressured stage of her academic career. Stuart Noble-Goodman believes his PFF experience was *the* deciding factor in his initial hiring at a liberal arts school because "I went into my interview with the vice president for academic affairs and talked about faculty preparation and the state of

higher education as it applied to liberal arts colleges for nearly an hour." Stuart later learned that "as I walked to my next interview with the department chair, she had already received a call from the VP with the message that I was, in her mind, the ideal candidate. Without PFF, I would have been just another candidate with energetic but vague ideas about what it means to be a faculty member at a school like this." Angela Bryan had a somewhat similar experience during her on-campus interviews at the University of Colorado. As it happened, her first meeting was with the dean of the graduate school, who was "thrilled" to discover that Angela had been a PFF participant because Colorado had just begun a PFF program of its own. The dean wanted to learn all about Angela's experience at Arizona State. Angela does not know whether that conversation actually helped her get the job, but it certainly made the interview with a dean go much easier.

For other alumni—Jason Cody and Peter Wyckoff are two examples—the PFF experience was even more literally a step into their academic careers. Pete was hired by his own biology PFF mentor at Guilford College after completing his doctorate at Duke. Although Jason did not do his PFF internship at Lake Forest College, that Northwestern cluster school subsequently hired him twice—first to a one-year visiting position, later in a tenure-track appointment in chemistry—largely as a result of his PFF affiliation.

Not all PFF alumni stories are successful ones, of course, and certainly very few alumni can so specifically track their success to PFF. Still, virtually all the alumni with whom we spoke praised PFF for giving them both general and pragmatic knowledge about the academic job market and, with that knowledge, the power to make informed choices. Surprisingly, almost all the alumni who were interviewed felt they really did have a choice at this stage of their careers; they were not simply grateful to have a job, period! For them, it seems PFF changed the very nature of what we, almost mindlessly, have come to call the horrible academic market. For the PFF alumni, the market was already more open and more inviting.

C. Differences PFF Made in the Initial Years in the Academy

If PFF made recent graduates more professionally sophisticated and gave them experience during the job search to relate to interviewing faculty as peers, it also prepared them for their first years on the job. Once again, however, this question did not register particularly high scores on the quantitative portion of the survey (3.4). One dimension of this preparation is simply the knowledge base that PFF alumni feel they have acquired in contrast to their non-PFF junior faculty peers. Angela Bryan remembers how many of the faces at her new faculty orientation at the University of Colorado were "painfully blank" as they were being told of the need to carefully balance teaching, service, and research. In several cases, alumni reported that just walking into a classroom for the first time was less stressful for

them than for their colleagues because through PFF they had already "been there, done that." "Many of my colleagues," says Wendy Crone, "have had no teaching experience and spend a lot of time struggling with their teaching." "In talking with them about various academic and teaching issues," she adds," I feel I have a massive advantage because of PFF." Jason Cody put it this way: "PFF eliminates first-time mistakes." Furthermore, because his PFF program "took care of the basic [pedagogical] matters," he has been able to "take his teaching to the next level" by applying ideas from various Northwestern PFF graduate student peers to his classrooms at Lake Forest.

PFF alumni were also much more likely to be familiar with a range of particular classroom issues. Carlota Ocampo notes that her PFF program at Howard provided her with a good sense of different student bodies, especially older, continuing education students. This knowledge, she says, "was great preparation for my current job, where I am teaching a wide variety of students." David Karp's PFF experience was not quite as useful, but looking back from his current position at Skidmore, he would now encourage PFF programs to focus more attention on "the ways in which the nature of undergraduate student backgrounds affects the nature of both your teaching and your advising." Wendy Crone reports that, thanks to PFF, "I am more familiar with literature on teaching, with case study approaches, with cooperative learning techniques, and so forth. Peers are continually asking me now if I can recommend specific teaching resources."

For some PFF alumni, the linkages between their PFF experiences and their initial years on the job are very direct. At the University of Denver, Scott Howard is now teaching a course in Milton that he had earlier team-taught with his PFF mentor at Seattle Pacific University. Without PFF, Scott reports, he would never have had this kind of preparatory experience.

A different kind of linkage between PFF experience and subsequent academic work can be seen in the way PFF alumni feel they have achieved a better balance, even a synergy, between their teaching and their research than that witnessed in many of their own graduate faculty advisors. Several alumni joined Kathee Godfrey in reporting that they are less likely than their former or present colleagues to see teaching and research as either distinct or in competition. Phil Camill (biology, Duke) speaks for many in affirming "life at a liberal arts college is great. I really enjoy the students and the balance of teaching and research." Others, like Carlota Ocampo, feel fortunate to be working in an institution where "pedagogical work counts as research." Even those now working in other academic settings have been able to bring their teaching and research into close alignment, including Charles Carter (religion, Duke), who, like several PFF alumni, has published papers specifically on his PFF experiences.

In various ways, most PFF alumni share Wendy Crone's sense that "PFF provided me with a basket of tools I'm still trying out, tools that I can pick and choose from as the need arises." One need that several alumni did not anticipate was serving as faculty mentors for their own junior faculty colleagues. Because Wendy has this "basket of tools," her own peers are continually asking her advice on various professional matters. "I've become," she says, "a *de facto* mentor to my colleagues." Kim Zeuli is having a similar experience: "I'm now mentoring eight junior colleagues, because PFF has given me a faster, quicker start," particularly in various teaching methods. Wendy and Kim are representative, not only of the willingness of PFF alumni to take on mentoring responsibilities, but also of peer acknowledgment that PFF has made them more seasoned and savvy professionals. Although Jason Cody has been more reluctant to step fully into the role of *de facto* mentor, he too feels more experienced than many of his peers and is frequently approached by them for advice. His seasoning, in fact, did not escape the notice of his chair as well, who took the time to mention it in his annual faculty report to the dean.

Programs taught them not only the overall importance of service as the "third leg" of faculty responsibility, but also how varied service requirements or expectations are at different institutions.

Of the effects of PFF training on alumni, peer mentoring is only the most exceptional, and perhaps most surprising. Virtually all report that through PFF they have a far better understanding of the importance of faculty mentoring, and many have eagerly sought out ways in their new positions to become supportive mentors of their own students. Scott Howard, for example, uses his experience of teaching Milton at Seattle Pacific University, an institution affiliated with the Free Methodist Church, not only to make theoretical disciplinary points for his University of Denver graduate students about distinct reading communities and reader expectations, but also to instruct them in the diversity of student populations they will inevitably encounter nationally at different academic sites. In this, of course, he is effectively repeating for his own students lessons he learned earlier in his Washington PFF program. Scott also started a graduate placement service at Denver, again modeled on successful ones from his own graduate experience. Zoe Warwick (psychology, Duke) now offers her graduate students at the University of Maryland-Baltimore County a PFF-type teaching seminar based upon "best practices" garnered from her program at Duke.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Most PFF alumni agree that their programs taught them not only the overall importance of service as the "third leg" of faculty responsibility, but also how varied service requirements or expectations are at different institutions. Rick Fehrenbacher (English, Duke) speaks for many alumni when he says discussions with his PFF cluster-campus mentor first opened his eyes to the tremendous and ongoing challenge of managing time so as to meet all three obligations of teaching, research, and service. Angela Bryan says that "had I not had some PFF experience with how to balance service and research, I wouldn't have known to say 'no'" to requests to serve on time-consuming and relatively unimportant committees.

PFF alumni feel they are on a faster track to tenure than their non-PFF colleagues. Although most would be hard pressed to offer any specific evidence for this, several agree with Joel Foisy that the experience of developing a PFF teaching portfolio was crucial preparation for putting together—without the "stress" that seemed common in their peers—an organized and comprehensive package of reappointment materials. Kathee Godfrey reports that at Fresno State she was required to submit formal "probationary plans" that articulate what she hopes to accomplish in her initial years there in terms of teaching, research and service. These plans were relatively easy to write, Kathee says, because PFF had already conditioned her to set very specific goals for herself and to conceive of her faculty life as a "triumvirate" of responsibilities. Paul Yoder (English, Duke) did not claim his PFF experience helped him achieve early tenure at the University of Arkansas-Little Rock, but he is sure it helped him over initial faculty jitters. One alumnus put it this way: "I'm solidly on track for tenure, and my annual reviews indicate as much. I detail this not to brag . . . but to make the point that without my understanding of what was coming, of what would be expected of me as a faculty member . . . an understanding derived almost wholly from PFF, I would be buried."

A somewhat different way of assessing the success of PFF is to listen to what some PFF alumni feel the program could have done better. An alumna from Arizona State said she wished she had "known more," when she graduated, "about how to negotiate the tricky world of departmental politics." Carlos Morrison would agree with another Howard alumnus's remark that "institutional governance and department politics were not really covered when I went through the PFF program, but these are critical to one's success in the academy." A graduate school classmate offered a more rhetorical (mixed metaphors and all) critique: "I wish PFF had done more with 'the art of politiking,' negotiating departmental mountains and abysses. (It can be a jungle out there!)" Paul Yoder says he would have benefited more from PFF if he had known which questions to ask of his faculty mentors: "I would have asked about factionalism within the department, about how well the faculty members got along, and what kinds of problems those rela-

tionships create in the implementation of programs and in the running of the department." "Department politics," Paul goes on to say, were "the single most troubling aspect of my first year or so on the job." Fortunately, not all alumni missed this kind of preparation, and many, like Rick Fehrenbacher, feel that their PFF experiences served as a critical introduction to the whole range of "department stuff": how committees get formed, how faculty negotiate differences, how petty squabbles can affect morale, what a chair can and cannot do. It prepared them, in short, to be a member of a departmental community as well as institutional, local, and professional ones.

A somewhat different way of assessing the success of PFF is to listen to what some PFF alumni feel the program could have done better.

One of the more surprising findings of the alumni survey and interviews is how many former PFFers have moved into administrative positions. Although it is certainly not a goal of PFF to prepare people for academic administration, it has clearly opened that option to several alumni and created a career path that they feel comfortable in following, if the personal and professional "fit" is right. Ray Person became chair of his department immediately (and unexpectedly) upon receiving tenure. He says that he is grateful for his PFF experience with cluster-campus mentors as he now assumes this responsibility in a more formal capacity. Carlota Ocampo was also appointed, in only her second year of full-time employment, as chair of the psychology program at Trinity College. Not only is she thus serving as mentor to other faculty subsequently hired in this program (many of whom, she notes, also have significant PFF experience), but she continues to serve as a prospective PFF mentor to graduate students at Howard. Says Carlota, "Graduate schools don't prepare you for the business/administrative side of academic life." PFF, however, clearly does. Rick Fehrenbacher (English, Duke) is thinking seriously about moving into "an administrative position because of the early interest PFF fostered in how departments work." Kathee Godfrey also says PFF helped her think more positively than many of her colleagues about the possibility of eventually moving into administration. Even now, she adds, it is the variety of roles she can assume as a faculty member that makes her job interesting and challenging.

Stuart Noble-Goodman represents an even more dramatic illustration of a PFFer whose career has taken him in administrative directions. Stuart's first job after graduate school was as director of graduate-student teaching programs at a large state university; his second was directing an undergraduate honors program at a small midwestern religious school. Currently, he is associate dean of arts and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sciences at the University of Redlands—all within a space of five short years. Clearly, this is an exceptional academic trajectory, but the credit Stuart gives PFF is more the norm than the anomaly: "I'm achieving most of the professional and personal goals I set for myself, and what success I've had would not have been possible without PFF; at every juncture of my academic and professional development, my participation in Preparing Future Faculty has made a crucial difference."

IV. Conclusion

Graduates now serving in administrative positions illustrate the commitment of alumni to promoting continuation of PFF and PFF-type activities. Alumni are grateful to the program for what it gave to them, and they have assumed, perhaps as part of their "service" to the academic profession, the responsibility to give something back. Thus Jason Cody participated in development of the chemistry component through the American Chemical Society program of Preparing Future Faculty, and Jennifer Egert, through participation in the American Psychological Association's (APA) Teaching and Educational Issues workgroup, has now become involved in its leadership of department-based PFF initiatives. Angela Bryan has also assumed a major role in the APA's development of a cross-country collaboration on a PFF program in psychology at Colorado and Yale.

Other alumni are currently involved in what might be called "next generation" professional development projects in higher education. Charles Carter has been selected as a Pew/Carnegie Fellow in their new initiative on the scholarship of teaching and learning. As one of twenty-eight faculty from across the country chosen for this honor, Charles will be conducting a project on the relationship between interdisciplinary studies and multimedia in promoting deeper learning. Jason Cody is now involved in both Project Kaleidoscope and the F21 Network for Science, Mathematics, and Technology educators. The goals of these projects are a research-rich curriculum and continuing innovation in the classroom.

For all of these academics, PFF has not only smoothed the transition between graduate school and their initial academic positions, but it has also brought them into the larger conversation of academic reform generally. At the center of this reform is the effort to create a better and more seamless fit between new Ph.D.s and the faculty roles/tasks they assume as they take their places in the full range of institutions of higher learning. Our alumni all agree that the essential principles of Preparing Future Faculty are ones that need to be promoted and expanded in order to be successful in that effort. As they become active voices in this broader national reform of higher education, there is every reason to expect that the success story of PFF will continue to be written.

Appendix

SUMMARY STATISTICAL TABLES

The survey of 271 doctoral alumni from Arizona State, Duke, Florida State, Howard, Minnesota, Northwestern, and University of Washington generated 129 responses, a response rate of 48 percent. Alumni were asked to assess the effectiveness of various components of a "typical" PFF program by rating those components on a scale of 1 (not valuable) to 5 (highly valuable). The individual components were themselves grouped into nine general categories (see Table C on page 23).

1. Professional development programs *outside* of PFF
2. Job Search
3. Faculty Life
4. Teaching
5. Mentor Relationships
6. Cluster Site Visits: Activities
7. Cluster Site Visits: Lessons
8. Graduate Institution Programs
9. Overall Impact of PFF1

Responses were subsequently sorted in terms of mean scores of all respondents (Tables A and B) and mean scores by institution (not included here). Responses were also sorted in terms of the percentage of given activities not covered by individual PFF programs (Table E), by ethnicity (Table F), and by general academic disciplines (Table G).

Two problems became immediately apparent. First, the 129 respondents were spread unevenly across institutions, so that Duke University had a considerably higher number of responses than the other six schools (probably because the survey originated from there). In order to adjust for this, we subsequently calculated all means both with and without the Duke numbers. In addition, we obtained a very small number of responses from some institutions, making it difficult to have confidence in an average response for those clusters. A second major problem—which appeared once we began comparing mean scores among institutions—was simply that not all PFF programs emphasized or even included the same set of

activities. In this case, one of the strengths of PFF—that programs are tailored to the needs of the local cluster—was, for comparative purposes, a handicap.

Because of these problems, we have chosen here to present only aggregate results of the survey. The first two summaries are of *PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Mean* scores. We present these summaries in two formats: the first (Table A) represents mean scores from all respondents; the second (Table B) represents mean scores *without* the responses from Duke alumni.

Tables C and D, *PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Category*, represents the individual survey questions grouped with similar activities. Here we present the mean scores for the category in two distinct ways. In Table C, we indicate the aggregate means for all respondents to the survey. But it also became clear to us in this table that some of our questions addressed issues that were neither goals nor priorities of the PFF program itself (even though some clusters had included them in their programs). Thus, in Table D, we recalculated the means scores by subtracting those items which over 40 percent of alumni said were "not covered" by their local PFF cluster. We report these recalibrated means in gray.

Table E, then, reports *PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Percent "Not Covered."* Many of the items listed here with high percentage rates of "not covered" are activities normally associated with traditional disciplinary and departmental graduate training: writing research statements, identifying research funding prospects, locating potential jobs. But it is striking that nearly 30 percent of responding alumni stated that they did not shadow a mentor or receive any assistance in drafting a cover letter for a job application; over 60 percent said they did not observe classes on the cluster campus, participate in any formal pedagogical coursework, or observe a cluster faculty meeting. Many of these activities we would have assumed to be "core components" of virtually all clusters.

Table F represents *PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Ethnicity* and Table G reports *PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Discipline*. Both tables attempt to provide a demographic snapshot of the alumni completing the survey and the relative value of PFF experiences to the different groups.

Table A: PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Mean

Q#	Question	# Resp	Mean	Std Dev	% Not Conv
71	Discussion with faculty	96	4.2	1.11	2.1
57	Experience with mentor's classes	97	4.2	1.94	20.6
33	Teaching statement	127	4.0	1.73	13.4
59	Discussion of faculty roles/responsibilities	97	4.0	1.47	7.2
78	Informal discussion groups	129	4.0	1.54	10.9
75	Faculty life at cluster institutions	96	3.9	1.40	5.2
39	Balancing research/teaching/service	125	3.9	1.62	12.0
84	Overall: Career choices	128	3.9	1.62	9.4
79	Formal programs or symposia	129	3.9	1.60	12.4
70	Observing classes	97	3.9	2.12	40.2
81	Practical workshops	128	3.8	1.89	23.4
31	Portfolio	126	3.8	1.97	25.4
51	Assessing your teaching	126	3.8	1.77	19.0
73	Observing faculty meetings	97	3.7	2.07	53.6
58	Shadowing mentor	96	3.7	1.99	27.1
47	Teaching diverse student populations	125	3.7	1.67	15.2
43	Institutional governance/departmental politics	123	3.6	1.67	16.3
49	Lecturing, leading discussions or labs	126	3.6	1.64	14.3
77	Hiring criteria at cluster institutions	96	3.6	1.71	18.8
29	C.V.	125	3.5	1.84	28.0
72	Discussion with students	97	3.5	1.93	29.9
44	Course/syllabus design	126	3.5	1.78	23.8
41	Tenure process/criteria	125	3.5	1.78	24.8
34	Interview process	126	3.5	1.79	23.8
46	Handling difficult teaching situations	126	3.5	1.64	17.5
40	Negotiating first years on job	125	3.5	1.78	25.6
74	Visiting campus resources (labs, library, etc.)	96	3.4	1.72	18.8
30	Cover Letter	126	3.4	1.86	33.3
86	Overall: Negotiating the first years on the job	127	3.4	1.82	17.3
80	Pedagogy coursework	128	3.4	1.91	40.6
76	Student life/instruction at cluster institutions	96	3.4	1.46	10.4
48	Assignments and grading	126	3.3	1.79	23.8
50	Mentoring and advising students	126	3.3	1.67	19.8
60	Discussion/collaboration on research project	97	3.3	1.87	50.5
85	Overall: Negotiating the job market	127	3.3	1.73	15.7
45	Use of technology in classroom	126	3.3	1.82	27.0
35	Job presentations	127	3.2	1.79	30.7
38	Salary/benefits	126	3.0	1.74	40.5
32	Research statement	125	3.0	1.71	43.2
37	Negotiating job offers	126	3.0	1.74	47.6
36	Locating potential jobs	126	2.9	1.71	34.1
42	Research/professional funding prospects	123	2.7	1.57	46.3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table B: PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Mean (w/out Duke)

Q#	Question	# Resp	Mean	Std Dev	% Not Conv
33	Teaching statement	79	4.2	1.47	7.6
71	Discussion with faculty	55	4.2	1.15	1.8
57	Experience with mentor's classes	59	4.1	1.89	18.6
84	Overall: Career choices	79	4.1	1.67	11.4
75	Faculty life at cluster institutions	55	4.0	1.48	7.3
39	Balancing research/teaching/service	78	4.0	1.70	14.1
78	Informal discussion groups	79	4.0	1.34	6.3
31	Portfolio	78	4.0	1.75	14.1
79	Formal programs or symposia	79	4.0	1.42	7.6
81	Practical workshops	78	4.0	1.47	9.0
47	Teaching diverse student populations	77	4.0	1.29	5.2
59	Discussion of faculty roles/responsibilities	59	3.9	1.48	6.8
51	Assessing your teaching	78	3.9	1.31	6.4
70	Observing classes	55	3.8	2.13	43.6
72	Discussion with students	55	3.7	2.09	38.2
49	Lecturing, leading discussions or labs	78	3.7	1.46	7.7
58	Shadowing mentor	58	3.6	1.96	24.1
77	Hiring criteria at cluster institutions	55	3.6	1.68	16.4
34	Interview process	78	3.6	1.86	24.4
29	C.V.	78	3.6	1.74	21.8
46	Handling difficult teaching situations	78	3.6	1.38	9.0
44	Course/syllabus design	78	3.6	1.55	12.8
74	Visiting campus resources (labs, library, etc.)	55	3.6	1.59	9.1
43	Institutional governance/departmental politics	77	3.6	1.73	18.2
40	Negotiating first years on job	78	3.6	1.88	28.2
60	Discussion/collaboration on research project	59	3.5	1.96	44.1
41	Tenure process/criteria	78	3.5	1.79	21.8
85	Overall: Negotiating the job market	78	3.5	1.78	15.4
76	Student life/instruction at cluster institutions	55	3.5	1.53	12.7
86	Overall: Negotiating the first years on the job	78	3.5	1.86	16.7
45	Use of technology in classroom	78	3.5	1.57	10.3
80	Pedagogy coursework	78	3.5	1.79	23.1
30	Cover Letter	78	3.5	1.75	25.6
19	T.A. Orientation or training	79	3.5	1.63	13.9
48	Assignments and grading	78	3.5	1.49	9.0
35	Job presentations	79	3.4	1.85	27.8
73	Observing faculty meetings	55	3.4	1.91	52.7
20	Pedagogical coursework	79	3.3	1.63	13.9
50	Mentoring and advising students	78	3.3	1.53	12.8
21	Career mentoring or development	78	3.2	1.85	37.2
37	Negotiating job offers	77	3.1	1.82	44.2
32	Research statement	77	3.1	1.74	39.0
38	Salary/benefits	78	3.0	1.71	41.0
22	Seminars on faculty roles/responsibilities	79	3.0	1.86	38.0
36	Locating potential jobs	78	2.9	1.65	29.5
42	Research/professional funding prospects	77	2.8	1.58	41.6

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table C: PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Category

Category means are in **bold**

Q#	Question	# Resp	Mean	Std Dev	% Not Cov
Professional development programs outside of PFF					
19	T.A. Orientation or training	129	3.3	1.68	18.6
20	Pedagogical coursework	129	3.2	1.62	15.5
21	Career mentoring or development	128	3.1	1.78	43.8
22	Seminars on faculty roles/responsibilities	128	2.9	1.81	40.6
Means of Category			**3.1**		**29.6**
Overall: Job Search					
29	C.V.	125	3.5	1.84	28.0
30	Cover letter	126	3.4	1.86	33.3
31	Portfolio	126	3.8	1.97	25.4
32	Research statement	125	3.0	1.71	43.2
33	Teaching statement	127	4.0	1.73	13.4
34	Interview process	126	3.5	1.79	23.8
35	Job presentations	127	3.2	1.79	30.7
36	Locating potential jobs	126	2.9	1.71	34.1
37	Negotiating job offers	126	3.0	1.74	47.6
Means of Category			**3.4**		**31.0**
Overall: Faculty Life					
38	Salary/benefits	126	3.0	1.74	40.5
39	Balancing research/teaching/service	125	3.9	1.62	12.0
40	Negotiating first years on job	125	3.5	1.78	25.6
41	Tenure process/criteria	125	3.5	1.78	24.8
42	Research/professional funding prospects	123	2.7	1.57	46.3
43	Institutional governance/departmental politics	123	3.6	1.67	16.3
Means of Category			**3.4**		**27.6**
Overall: Teaching					
44	Course/syllabus design	126	3.5	1.78	23.8
45	Use of technology in classroom	126	3.3	1.82	27.0
46	Handling difficult teaching situations	126	3.5	1.64	17.5
47	Teaching diverse student populations	125	3.7	1.67	15.2
48	Assignments and grading	126	3.3	1.79	23.8
49	Lecturing, leading discussions or labs	126	3.6	1.64	14.3
50	Mentoring and advising students	126	3.3	1.67	19.8
51	Assessing your teaching	126	3.8	1.77	19.0
Means of Category			**3.5**		**20.1**
Aspects of Mentor Relationship					
57	Experience with mentor's classes	97	4.2	1.94	20.6
58	Shadowing mentor	96	3.7	1.99	27.1
59	Discussion of faculty roles/responsibilities	97	4.0	1.47	7.2
60	Discussion/collaboration on research project	97	3.3	1.87	50.5
Means of Category			**3.8**		**26.4**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table C: PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Category, continued

Category means are in **bold**

Q#	Question	# Resp	Mean	Std Dev	% Not Cov
Site Visits: Activities					
70	Observing classes	97	3.9	2.12	40.2
71	Discussion with faculty	96	4.2	1.11	2.1
72	Discussion with students	97	3.5	1.93	29.9
73	Observing faculty meetings	97	3.7	2.07	53.6
74	Visiting campus resources (labs, library, etc.)	96	3.4	1.72	18.8
Means of Category			**3.7**		**28.9**
Site Visits: Learned					
75	Faculty life at cluster institutions	96	3.9	1.40	5.2
76	Student life/instruction at cluster institutions	96	3.4	1.46	10.4
77	Hiring criteria at cluster institutions	96	3.6	1.71	18.8
Means of Category			**3.6**		**11.5**
Program at Own Institution					
78	Informal discussion groups	129	4.0	1.54	10.9
79	Formal programs or symposia	129	3.9	1.60	12.4
80	Pedagogy coursework	128	3.4	1.91	40.6
81	Practical workshops	128	3.8	1.89	23.4
Means of Category			**3.8**		**21.8**
Overall Impact of PFF					
84	Overall: Career choices	128	3.9	1.62	9.4
85	Overall: Negotiating the job market	127	3.3	1.73	15.7
86	Overall: Negotiating the first years on the job	127	3.4	1.82	17.3
Means of Category			**3.5**		**14.1**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table D: PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Category

Category means are in **bold**. Means calculated in **gray** represent the total mean minus those activities 40% or more alumni reported "not covered" in their cluster.

Q#	Question	# Resp	Mean	Std Dev	% Not Cov
Professional development programs outside of PFF					
19	T.A. Orientation or training	129	3.3	1.68	18.6
20	Pedagogical coursework	129	3.2	1.62	15.5
~~21~~	~~Career mentoring or development~~	~~128~~	~~3.1~~	~~1.78~~	~~43.8~~
~~22~~	~~Seminars on faculty roles/responsibilities~~	~~128~~	~~2.9~~	~~1.81~~	~~40.6~~
Means of Category			**3.1(3.3)**		**26.6(17.1)**
Overall: Job Search					
29	C.V.	125	3.5	1.84	28.0
30	Cover Letter	126	3.4	1.86	33.3
31	Portfolio	126	3.8	1.97	25.4
~~32~~	~~Research statement~~	~~126~~	~~3.0~~	~~1.71~~	~~43.2~~
33	Teaching statement	127	4.0	1.73	13.4
34	Interview process	126	3.5	1.79	23.8
35	Job presentations	127	3.2	1.79	30.7
36	Locating potential jobs	126	2.9	1.71	34.1
~~37~~	~~Negotiating job offers~~	~~126~~	~~3.0~~	~~1.74~~	~~47.6~~
Means of Category			**3.4(3.5)**		**31.0(27.0)**
Overall: Faculty Life					
~~38~~	~~Salary/benefits~~	~~126~~	~~3.0~~	~~1.74~~	~~40.5~~
39	Balancing research/teaching/service	125	3.9	1.62	12.0
40	Negotiating first years on job	125	3.5	1.78	25.6
41	Tenure process/criteria	125	3.5	1.78	24.8
~~42~~	~~Research/professional funding prospects~~	~~123~~	~~2.7~~	~~1.57~~	~~46.3~~
43	Institutional governance/departmental politics	123	3.6	1.67	16.3
Means of Category			**3.4(3.6)**		**27.6(19.7)**
Overall: Teaching					
44	Course/syllabus design	126	3.5	1.78	23.8
45	Use of technology in classroom	126	3.3	1.82	27.0
46	Handling difficult teaching situations	126	3.5	1.64	17.5
47	Teaching diverse student populations	125	3.7	1.67	15.2
48	Assignments and grading	126	3.3	1.79	23.8
49	Lecturing, leading discussions or labs	126	3.6	1.64	14.3
50	Mentoring and advising students	126	3.3	1.67	19.8
51	Assessing your teaching	126	3.8	1.77	19.0
Means of Category			**3.6**		**20.1**
Aspects of Mentor Relationship					
57	Experience with mentor's classes	97	4.2	1.94	20.6
58	Shadowing mentor	96	3.7	1.99	27.1
59	Discussion of faculty roles/responsibilities	97	4.0	1.47	7.2
~~60~~	~~Discussion/collaboration on research project~~	~~97~~	~~3.3~~	~~1.87~~	~~50.5~~
Means of Category			**3.8(4.0)**		**26.4(18.3)**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table D: PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by Category, continued

Category means are in **bold**. Means calculated in **gray** represent the total mean minus those activities 40% or more alumni reported "not covered" in their cluster.

Q#	Question	# Resp	Mean	Std Dev	% Not Cov
Site Visits: Activities					
~~70~~	~~Observing classes~~	~~97~~	~~3.9~~	~~2.12~~	~~40.2~~
71	Discussion with faculty	96	4.2	1.11	2.1
72	Discussion with students	97	3.5	1.93	29.9
~~73~~	~~Observing faculty meetings~~	~~97~~	~~3.7~~	~~2.07~~	~~53.6~~
74	Visiting campus resources (labs, library, etc.)	96	3.4	1.72	18.8
Means of Category			**3.7 (3.7)**		**28.9 (16.9)**
Site Visits: Learned					
75	Faculty life at cluster institutions	96	3.9	1.40	5.2
76	Student life/instruction at cluster institutions	96	3.4	1.46	10.4
77	Hiring criteria at cluster institutions	96	3.6	1.71	18.8
Means of Category			**3.6**		**11.5**
Program at Own Institution					
78	Informal discussion groups	129	4.0	1.54	10.9
79	Formal programs or symposia	129	3.9	1.60	12.4
~~80~~	~~Pedagogy coursework~~	~~128~~	~~3.4~~	~~1.91~~	~~40.6~~
81	Practical workshops	128	3.8	1.89	23.4
Means of Category			**3.8 (3.9)**		**21.8 (15.6)**
Overall Impact of PFF					
84	Overall: Career choices	128	3.9	1.62	9.4
85	Overall: Negotiating the job market	127	3.3	1.73	15.7
86	Overall: Negotiating the first years on the job	127	3.4	1.82	17.3
Means of Category			**3.5**		**14.1**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table E: PFF "Value" Question Results: Sorted by % Not Covered

Q#	Question	# Resp	Mean	Std Dev	% Not Cov
73	Observing faculty meetings	97	3.7	2.07	53.6
60	Discussion/collaboration on research project	97	3.3	1.87	50.5
37	Negotiating job offers	126	3.0	1.74	47.6
42	Research/professional funding prospects	123	2.7	1.57	46.3
32	Research statement	125	3.0	1.71	43.2
80	Pedagogy coursework	128	3.4	1.91	40.6
38	Salary/benefits	126	3.0	1.74	40.5
70	Observing classes	97	3.9	2.12	40.2
36	Locating potential jobs	126	2.9	1.71	34.1
30	Cover Letter	126	3.4	1.86	33.3
35	Job presentations	127	3.2	1.79	30.7
72	Discussion with students	97	3.5	1.93	29.9
29	C.V.	125	3.5	1.84	28.0
58	Shadowing mentor	96	3.7	1.99	27.1
45	Use of technology in classroom	126	3.3	1.82	27.0
40	Negotiating first years on job	125	3.5	1.78	25.6
31	Portfolio	126	3.8	1.97	25.4
41	Tenure process/criteria	125	3.5	1.78	24.8
44	Course/syllabus design	126	3.5	1.78	23.8
34	Interview process	126	3.5	1.79	23.8
48	Assignments and grading	126	3.3	1.79	23.8
81	Practical workshops	128	3.8	1.89	23.4
57	Experience with mentor's classes	97	4.2	1.94	20.6
50	Mentoring and advising students	126	3.3	1.67	19.8
51	Assessing your teaching	126	3.8	1.77	19.0
77	Hiring criteria at cluster institutions	96	3.6	1.71	18.8
74	Visiting campus resources (labs, library, etc.)	96	3.4	1.72	18.8
46	Handling difficult teaching situations	126	3.5	1.64	17.5
86	Overall: Negotiating the first years on the job	127	3.4	1.82	17.3
43	Institutional governance/departmental politics	123	3.6	1.67	16.3
85	Overall: Negotiating the job market	127	3.3	1.73	15.7
47	Teaching diverse student populations	125	3.7	1.67	15.2
49	Lecturing, leading discussions or labs	126	3.6	1.64	14.3
33	Teaching statement	127	4.0	1.73	13.4
79	Formal programs or symposia	129	3.9	1.60	12.4
39	Balancing research/teaching/service	125	3.9	1.62	12.0
78	Informal discussion groups	129	4.0	1.54	10.9
76	Student life/instruction at cluster institutions	96	3.4	1.46	10.4
84	Overall: Career choices	128	3.9	1.62	9.4
59	Discussion of faculty roles/responsibilities	97	4.0	1.47	7.2
75	Faculty life at cluster institutions	96	3.9	1.40	5.2
71	Discussion with faculty	96	4.2	1.11	2.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table F: PFF "Value" Question Mean Results: Sorted by Ethnicity

The upper quartile is in **bold**. The lower quartile is in **gray**.

Q#	N=	Asian 5	African American 13	Hispanic 7	Caucasion 102	Other 3
19	T.A. Orientation or training	**2.8**	3.9	**3.0**	3.2	3.7
20	Pedagogical coursework	3.3	3.8	3.3	3.1	**3.0**
21	Career mentoring or development	3.3	3.9	**2.8**	**2.7**	3.5
22	Seminars on faculty roles/responsibilities	**3.0**	**4.1**	**3.0**	**2.5**	**5.0**
29	C.V.	3.5	**4.1**	**4.1**	3.4	3.3
30	Cover Letter	**3.0**	3.7	**4.1**	3.4	**3.0**
31	Portfolio	3.8	**4.6**	3.3	3.8	**4.5**
32	Research statement	3.5	3.7	3.5	**2.8**	4.0
33	Teaching statement	4.0	**4.2**	**4.2**	**4.1**	4.0
34	Interview process	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.5	**2.3**
35	Job presentations	4.0	**4.0**	3.5	**3.0**	**2.5**
36	Locating potential jobs	3.5	3.6	3.8	**2.7**	**3.0**
37	Negotiating job offers	**4.3**	**2.8**	**2.8**	**2.9**	**2.5**
38	Salary/benefits	**4.5**	3.5	**2.4**	**3.0**	3.5
39	Balancing research/teaching/service	**4.8**	**4.6**	**4.1**	3.9	**4.3**
40	Negotiating first years on job	**4.5**	3.3	3.8	3.5	4.0
41	Tenure process/criteria	**4.8**	3.5	3.4	3.5	4.0
42	Research/professional funding prospects	**4.5**	3.5	**3.0**	**2.5**	**3.0**
43	Institutional/departmental politics	**4.8**	3.7	3.4	3.5	4.0
44	Course/syllabus design	3.5	**4.5**	3.5	3.4	3.5
45	Use of technology in classroom	3.5	3.9	3.5	3.2	3.5
46	Handling difficult teaching situations	**4.3**	3.9	**3.1**	3.4	4.0
47	Teaching diverse student populations	**4.8**	**4.4**	3.6	3.6	**4.5**
48	Assignments and grading	**4.3**	**4.2**	3.4	3.2	3.5
49	Lecturing, leading discussions or labs	**4.5**	**4.2**	3.3	3.4	**4.3**
50	Mentoring and advising students	**4.5**	**4.3**	3.4	3.1	**4.7**
51	Assessing your teaching	**4.8**	**4.7**	**3.0**	3.7	4.0
57	Experience with mentor's classes	**4.5**	**4.7**	3.9	**4.1**	**4.5**
58	Shadowing mentor	**2.5**	3.3	3.6	3.9	**3.0**
59	Discussion of faculty roles/responsibilities	3.3	**4.2**	**4.4**	4.0	3.5
60	Discussion/collaboration on research project	**2.5**	3.9	**3.0**	3.3	4.0
70	Observing classes	**5.0**	**4.7**	3.5	3.8	**5.0**
71	Discussion with faculty	**5.0**	**4.5**	**4.3**	**4.2**	**5.0**
72	Discussion with students	**4.5**	3.9	3.5	3.3	**4.5**
73	Observing faculty meetings	**2.0**	4.0	**1.8**	3.8	**2.0**
74	Visiting campus resources (labs, etc.)	**4.5**	**4.7**	**2.9**	3.3	4.0
75	Faculty life at cluster institutions	**5.0**	**3.1**	4.0	3.9	**5.0**
76	Student life at cluster institutions	**5.0**	3.4	**3.1**	3.2	4.0
77	Hiring criteria at cluster institutions	**4.5**	**3.1**	3.4	3.5	4.0
78	Informal discussion groups	**4.5**	**4.3**	3.5	4.0	3.7
79	Formal programs or symposia	**4.5**	**4.4**	3.8	3.9	**4.3**
80	Pedagogy coursework	3.5	**4.0**	**3.0**	3.4	**3.0**
81	Practical workshops	**4.5**	**4.3**	3.5	3.7	**4.5**
84	Overall: Career choices	**4.8**	**4.5**	3.6	3.8	**4.3**
85	Overall: Negotiating the job market	4.0	3.9	3.3	3.3	3.7
86	Overall: Negotiating the first years	**4.5**	3.9	3.5	3.3	4.0
Mean		**4.0**	**4.0**	**3.4**	**3.4**	**3.8**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table G: PFF "Value" Question Mean Results: Sorted by Discipline

The upper quartile is indicated in **bold.** Some high or low rankings are an artifact of only one or two responses.

Q #		Phys Sci	Biol Sci	Soc Sci	Human.	Prof.
	N=	22	21	29	50	6
19	T.A. Orientation or training	2.9	3.1	3.5	3.5	**4.3**
20	Pedagogical coursework	2.9	3.1	3.5	3.2	3.6
21	Career mentoring or development	3.1	2.8	3.5	2.8	3.6
22	Seminars on faculty roles/responsibilities	3.6	2.9	3.3	2.7	2.0
29	C.V.	3.4	2.9	3.3	3.8	**4.4**
30	Cover Letter	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.8	3.6
31	Portfolio	**4.3**	3.1	3.6	3.8	**4.6**
32	Research statement	3.2	2.8	3.4	2.7	3.2
33	Teaching statement	**4.3**	3.3	**4.2**	**4.2**	**4.5**
34	Interview process	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.7	**4.2**
35	Job presentations	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.8
36	Locating potential jobs	3.0	2.7	2.8	3.0	3.2
37	Negotiating job offers	2.8	2.9	2.5	3.3	3.2
38	Salary/benefits	3.4	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.8
39	Balancing research/teaching/service	**4.1**	3.5	3.7	4.0	**4.8**
40	Negotiating first years on job	3.9	2.9	3.1	3.5	**4.2**
41	Tenure process/criteria	3.9	3.1	3.4	3.4	**4.6**
42	Research/professional funding prospects	3.1	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.8
43	Institutional/departmental politics	3.8	3.1	3.4	3.6	**4.6**
44	Course/syllabus design	3.9	3.6	3.3	3.3	4.0
45	Use of technology in classroom	3.9	3.3	2.7	3.1	**4.5**
46	Handling difficult teaching situations	4.0	3.0	3.6	3.2	3.8
47	Teaching diverse student populations	**4.1**	3.1	3.7	3.7	4.0
48	Assignments and grading	3.9	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.7
49	Lecturing, leading discussions or labs	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.2	3.8
50	Mentoring and advising students	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.8
51	Assessing your teaching	**4.1**	3.7	3.7	3.6	**4.3**
57	Experience with mentor's classes	**4.3**	**4.4**	4.0	4.0	4.0
58	Shadowing mentor	4.0	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.3
59	Discussion of faculty roles/responsibilities	**4.1**	3.6	3.6	**4.1**	**4.8**
60	Discussion/collaboration on research project	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.6	**4.5**
70	Observing classes	3.6	4.0	3.8	4.0	**4.5**
71	Discussion with faculty	**4.2**	3.9	**4.2**	**4.3**	**4.8**
72	Discussion with students	3.6	3.1	3.6	3.5	3.0
73	Observing faculty meetings	3.5	3.2	4.0	3.9	0.0
74	Visiting campus resources (labs, etc.)	3.4	3.8	3.3	3.4	**4.2**
75	Faculty life at cluster institutions	**4.5**	3.2	**4.1**	3.8	**4.8**
76	Student life at cluster institutions	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.2	3.8
77	Hiring criteria at cluster institutions	3.6	3.1	3.9	3.3	**4.6**
78	Informal discussion groups	3.9	3.8	**4.2**	3.8	**4.8**
79	Formal programs or symposia	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.8	**4.7**
80	Pedagogy coursework	3.6	2.8	3.6	3.2	3.8
81	Practical workshops	**4.1**	3.7	3.6	3.7	**4.5**
84	Overall: Career choices	**4.5**	3.8	3.7	3.7	**5.0**
85	Overall: Negotiating the job market	3.6	2.8	3.2	3.3	**4.8**
86	Overall: Negotiating the first years	3.7	2.6	3.3	3.4	**4.2**
Mean		3.7	3.3	3.4	3.5	4.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AAC&U Statement on Liberal Learning

A truly liberal education is one that prepares us to live responsible, productive, and creative lives in a dramatically changing world. It is an education that fosters a well-grounded intellectual resilience, a disposition toward lifelong learning, and an acceptance of responsibility for the ethical consequences of our ideas and actions. Liberal education requires that we understand the foundations of knowledge and inquiry about nature, culture and society; that we master core skills of perception, analysis, and expression; that we cultivate a respect for truth; that we recognize the importance of historical and cultural context; and that we explore connections among formal learning, citizenship, and service to our communities.

We experience the benefits of liberal learning by pursuing intellectual work that is honest, challenging, and significant, and by preparing ourselves to use knowledge and power in responsible ways. Liberal learning is not confined to particular fields of study. What matters in liberal education is substantial content, rigorous methodology and an active engagement with the societal, ethical, and practical implications of our learning. The spirit and value of liberal learning are equally relevant to all forms of higher education and to all students.

Because liberal learning aims to free us from the constraints of ignorance, sectarianism, and myopia, it prizes curiosity and seeks to expand the boundaries of human knowledge. By its nature, therefore, liberal learning is global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility, for nothing less will equip us to understand our world and to pursue fruitful lives.

The ability to think, to learn, and to express oneself both rigorously and creatively, the capacity to understand ideas and issues in context, the commitment to live in society, and the yearning for truth are fundamental features of our humanity. In centering education upon these qualities, liberal learning is society's best investment in our shared future.

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges & Universities, October 1998.

AAC&U encourages distribution, so long as attribution is given.

Please address general inquiries to info@aacu.nw.dc.us.

AAC&U is the leading national association devoted to advancing and strengthening liberal learning for all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Since its founding in 1915, AAC&U's membership has grown to more than 740 accredited public and private colleges and universities of every type and size.

AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Its mission is to reinforce the collective commitment to liberal education at both the national and local levels and to help individual institutions keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges.

For additional information about AAC&U programs and publications, visit www.aacu-edu.org.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Council of Graduate Schools is dedicated to the improvement and advancement of graduate education. Its members are colleges and universities engaged in research, scholarship, and the preparation of candidates for advanced degrees.

Association of American Colleges and Universities

The Association of American Colleges & Universities is devoted to advancing and strengthening liberal learning for all students. AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning to reinforce a collective commitment to liberal education to help individual institutions keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work.

Preparing Future Faculty

PFF Staff and Contact Information

Jerry Gaff, Co-Director
Senior Scholar, AAC&U
gaff@aacu.nw.dc.us

Anne Pruitt-Logan, Co-Director
Scholar in Residence, CGS
apruitt@cgs.nche.org

Preparing Future Faculty National Office
1818 R Street, N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20009-1604
(202) 387-3760 • (202) 265-9532 fax
pff@aacu.nw.dc.us

How to learn more about the PFF Program?

The PFF national office maintains a vast collection of materials from the participating campuses as well as from the higher education literature. In addition to PFF occasional papers published by AAC&U and CGS, the resources include speeches and reports, sample syllabi and seminar outlines, and much more.

The national staff also manages an electronic mailing list, PFFNET, which is available to anyone interested in the program.

Information about all these resources and papers is available on the PFF website <www.preparing-faculty.org>

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").